Inner City Report:

A Snapshot of Thirteen Calgary Communities

Inner City
Family Resource
Centre Network

Bankview
Cliff Bungalow
Connaught
Downtown
Eau Claire
Erlton
Inglewood
Lower Mount Royal
Mission
Ramsay
Sunalta
Victoria Park

Prepared by The City of Calgary:
Community Strategies and Community and Neighbourhood Services
in consultation with the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network.
Sponsored by Calgary Rocky View Child and Family Services.

November 2000

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary 4

II. Introduction
1. Background 6
2. Methodology 7

III. Findings
1. Demographic Profile 8
2. Issues and Challenges 15
3. Services 22
4. Experiencing a Sense of Community 32

IV. Volunteers
1. Sharing Strengths and Talents 33

V. Recommendations 34

Appendix A
Origin of Survey 35

Appendix B
Questionnaire 36

Appendix C
Volunteer Opportunity Form 44

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Area of Residence 8
Table 1.2 Community of Residence 9
Table 1.3 Communities by Association 10
Table 1.4 Mobility of Respondent 11
Table 1.5 Age of Respondent 11
Table 1.6 Gender of Respondent 12
Table 1.7 Household Size of Respondent 12
Table 1.8 Family Structure of Respondent 13
Table 1.9 Annual Household Income of Respondent 19
Table 1.10 Birthplace of Respondent 14
Table 1.11 Length of Residency in Canada (If born in a different country) 14

Table 2.1 Community by Key Issues and Challenges 16
Table 2.2 Top Ranked Issues and Challenges According to Themes 17

Table 3.1 Community by Services Used in the Inner City 23
Table 3.2 Respondent Specified Services/Agencies Used 25
Table 3.3 Community by Services Most Wanted in the Inner City 28
Table 3.4 Reasons Given For Not Using Community Programs 30
Table 3.5 Preferred Location for Services 31

Table 4.1 Sources of Support and Sense of Belonging 32

Origin of Survey 35

I. Executive Summary

The Inner City Survey was conducted between October 1999 and February 2000, using a convenience sample of 470 residents living in thirteen inner city communities south of the Bow River in Calgary, Alberta. Respondents completed a short questionnaire to provide a community voice around the issues of key concern. The survey also looked at which services are used in these inner city neighbourhoods, what is wanted and preferred locations to house these services.

It is important to note that because a convenience sample was used, it is not possible to generalize the findings to all members of the thirteen inner city communities surveyed. What this means is, the findings apply only to those who completed the survey questionnaire. **Still, because it offers valuable insight into the views of those who returned completed questionnaires, the report can provide direction for future planning and service development in these inner city communities in Calgary.**

The results of this survey are intended to inform discussions around the feasibility of developing a Community Resource Centre in the inner city. The Centre would be an easy access, 'one-stop-shopping' facility for a full range of services and programs. It is anticipated that it would be a place for people to meet with peers or neighbours for coffee, share talents, utilize services, and receive needed supports.

The findings point to the following as key issues of concern for respondents:

- Crime, safety and violence
- Access to health care services
- Affordable housing
- Inadequate financial resources

Four services/agencies emerged as those most used, and interestingly, those most wanted in the area:

- Health/medical/family resource centres
- Schools
- Library
- Recreation/leisure programs/facilities

The main reasons cited for not using services currently offered included:

- Lack of knowledge of available programs
- Inconvenient times
- Prohibitive cost

Respondents preferred the following locations for housing a range of services and programs:

- School
- Community association
- Community health centre
- Recreation centre

The results of this survey suggest that there is a desire to work toward "generating a real sense of 'community'" within the inner city. Respondents derived a sense of community and belonging from:

- Friends
- Family
- Neighbours

II. Introduction

1. Background

As a result of the Alberta Government's redesign of Children's Services, Calgary Healthy Start service providers[1] came to together in the mid-1990s to discuss how they could best serve Calgary's inner city communities. By 1999, the group had attracted the interest of other service providers as well as concerned citizens. Linked around a common vision, at this time, the group formally established itself as the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network (ICFRN). Comprised of residents and social service agencies located in thirteen inner city communities south of the Bow River in Calgary[2], the ICFRCN (or Network) formed to coordinate resources and services to meet the needs of the inner city communities and those communities that use these services. Its goal is to facilitate the formation of one or more Community Coordinating Councils (CCC)[3] in the inner city to provide community and service agency input into the planning and delivery of services for families and individuals.

The Inner City Survey was designed by the Inner City Survey Sub-Committee with input from all members of the ICFRCN. The purpose of the survey was to give community members a voice into service requirements of the inner city communities of Sunalta, Bankview, Connaught, Lower Mount Royal, Cliff Bungalow-Mission, Erlton, Downtown, Eau Claire, Chinatown, Victoria Park, Ramsay, and Inglewood.

As one part of the information gathering process, the results of the Inner City Survey will assist in the formation of an inner city CCC. In turn, it will facilitate an investigation by the CCC and the Network into the possibility of developing a "one-stop-shopping" Community Resource Centre in the inner city. With easy access to a full range of services and programs, the Centre would be a place for those in the inner city to meet peers or neighbours for coffee, share talents, utilize services, and receive needed supports.

---

[1] This partnership was comprised of the Calgary Catholic Immigration Society (CCIS); Calgary Urban Project Society (CUPS); Alberta Vocational Centre (now Bow Valley College); and Family Connections.

[2] Partners in the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network include: Community residents; The City of Calgary's Community & Social Development and Parks & Recreation departments; Calgary Rocky View Child and Family Services; Alexandra Community Health Centre; Calgary Public Library, Memorial Park Branch; Calgary Catholic Immigration Society/Family Place; Calgary Chinese Community Services Association; Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Council; Churchill Park Family Care Society; Catholic Family Service; Mosaic Centre (CIAS); CUPS Community Health Centre; and 8th and 8th Health Centre.

[3] Initiated by Calgary Rocky View Child and Family Services, Community Coordinating Councils (CCC) have been developed to bring the community voice to the dialogue of child and family services, together with funders and service providers. They act as an advisory body and as a planning group. A CCC helps to ensure that local services are coordinated, integrated, and delivered in ways that are responsive to their communities. Members could be, among others, local residents, community representatives, youth, consumers, or service providers who work in the community. The majority of a CCC's membership are community residents selected to reflect the composition of the communities represented.

103-06203/

2. Methodology

A questionnaire comprised of fifteen open- and close-ended questions was produced in October 1999 (see Appendix B). In an effort to include the views of non-English speaking community members, the questionnaire was translated into Chinese, Serbo-Croatian, Tagalog (Filipino), and Polish.

Due to limited resources, and with a goal to reach as many people as possible, availability or convenience sampling procedures were used to obtain participants. As such, the questionnaire was distributed and collected over a five month period (October 1999 to February 2000) to various inner city service agencies, schools, facilities and at a variety of social events in the area. Individual agencies and members of the Network were responsible for promoting the survey within their own agencies and at the various events (see Appendix A). Additionally, the Beltline Pool, Inglewood Pool, and Memorial Park Library were designated as convenient drop-off points for completed questionnaires. To encourage participation, prizes such as swim passes, zoo passes, and small candies/chocolate bars were drawn and awarded to those who completed a questionnaire.

Of the 2000 questionnaires printed and distributed, 470 (23.5%) were completed and returned. Of these, 43 were translated questionnaires: 19 (4%) were in Chinese; 13 (3%) in Serbo-Croatian; 8 (2%) in Tagalog (Filipino); and 3 (1%) in Polish.

It is important to note that because a convenience sample was used, it is not possible to generalize these findings to all members of the thirteen inner city communities surveyed (i.e. a random sampling procedures were not employed). What this means is, the findings reported herein apply only to those who completed the survey questionnaire. The report is not intended to replace census data and other statistical documents. **Still, because it offers valuable insight into the views of those who returned completed questionnaires, this report can provide direction for future planning and service development in these inner city communities in Calgary.**

III. Findings

1. Demographic Profile

Community of Residence

Residents from all identified thirteen inner city communities participated in the survey. The Tri-Area communities of Victoria Park, Inglewood, and Ramsey had the highest number of respondents (n=140), or 30% of the 464 people who stated which community they lived in. Twenty-one percent (n=97) of the respondents came from the communities of Cliff Bungalow-Mission, Connaught, Erlton, and Lower Mount Royal. Residents of Chinatown, Downtown, and Eau Claire (n=83) represented 18% of the respondents, while Bankview and Sunalta (n=9) represented just 2% of the total (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 Area of Residence

Area	Number	Percentage
Tri-Area[1]	170	30.0
Central[2]	97	21.0
Downtown[3]	83	18.0
West[4]	9	2.0
Other[5]	135	29.0
Total Responses	464	101.0*
Missing	6	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

[1] Victoria Park, Inglewood, Ramsey
[2] Cliff Bungalow-Mission, Connaught, Erlton, Lower Mount Royal
[3] Chinatown, Downtown, Eau Claire
[4] Bankview, Sunalta
[5] Communities by association (i.e. reside in other communities) (see page 10)
* >100 due to rounding

Table 1.2 provides a detailed listing of respondents by individual community of residence. The community of Ramsay had the highest number of respondents (n=91) or 29% of the total. This was followed by Downtown (n=67; 14%). Twenty-nine percent (n=135) of the respondents lived in other communities.

Table 1.2 Community of Residence

Community	Number	Percentage
Ramsay	91	20.0
Downtown	67	14.0
Connaught	30	7.0
Victoria Park	25	5.0
Inglewood	24	5.0
Cliff Bungalow	20	4.0
Erlton	20	4.0
Mission	18	4.0
Chinatown	13	3.0
Lower Mount Royal	9	2.0
Sunalta	5	1.0
Bankview	4	1.0
Eau Claire	3	1.0
Other*	135	29.0
Total Responses	464	100.0
Missing	6	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

*Communities by association

Communities by Association

Twenty-nine percent of respondents (n=135) stated that they lived in other parts of the city. For example, 7% (n=9) were from Forest Lawn; 8% (n=11) were from Scarboro; and 5% (n=7) were from Parkhill (Table 1.3).

Table 1.3 Communities by Association

Community	Number	Percentage*
Scarboro	11	8.0
Forest Lawn	9	7.0
Parkhill	7	5.0
Not Specified	5	4.0
Dover	4	3.0
Edgemont	4	3.0
Elbow Park	4	3.0
Brentwood	3	2.0
Bridgeland	3	2.0
Crescent Heights	3	2.0
Killarney	3	2.0
Martindale	3	2.0
Rundle	3	2.0
Stanley Park	3	2.0
Sunnyside	3	2.0
Bowness	2	1.0
Falconridge	2	1.0
Knobhill	2	1.0
Marlborough	2	1.0
Mount Royal	2	1.0
Radisson	2	1.0
Rideau Park	2	1.0
Roxboro	2	1.0
Southland	2	1.0
Temple	2	1.0
Thorncliffe	2	1.0
Other	2	1.0
Acadia	1	1.0
Altadore	1	1.0
Arbour Lake	1	1.0
Braeside	1	1.0
Capitol Hill	1	1.0
Coral Spring	1	1.0
Deeridge	1	1.0
Elboya	1	1.0
Erinwoods	1	1.0
Fairview	1	1.0
Glenbrook	1	1.0
Glendale	1	1.0
Greenview	1	1.0
Hidden Valley	1	1.0
Highland	1	1.0
Huntington Hills	1	1.0
Kensington	1	1.0
Lakeview	1	1.0
Lincoln Park	1	1.0
Marlborough	1	1.0
McKenzie Lake	1	1.0
Midnapore	1	1.0
Millican-Ogden	1	1.0
Montgomery	1	1.0
North Haven	1	1.0
Oakridge	1	1.0
Panorama Hills	1	1.0
Parkland	1	1.0
Penbrooke	1	1.0
Renfrew	1	1.0
Richmond Hill	1	1.0
Riverbend	1	1.0
Ross Carrock	1	1.0
Southwood	1	1.0
Spring Bank	1	1.0
Spruce Cliff	1	1.0
University	1	1.0
Valley Ridge	1	1.0
Varsity	1	1.0
Vista Heights	1	1.0
Whitehorn	1	1.0
Wildwood	1	1.0
Windsor Park	1	1.0
Total:	135**	100.0

(Non-probability sample)

* Percentage of respondents who are members of communities by association (n=135).

** This number is the total number of respondents who selected Other' for the community they currently live in (Appendix B: Question 1).

Mobility

The majority of respondents (53%) have lived in the inner city for 5 years or less. In particular, 19% (n=88) have lived in the inner city for less than one year. Thirteen percent (n=60) have lived in these communities for 5 to 10 years, while 26% (n=119) are long time residents of more than 10 years (Table 1.4).

Table 1. 4 Mobility of Respondent

Length of Residency	Number	Percentage
Less than 1 year	88	19.0
1 to 5 years	155	34.0
5 to 10 years	60	13.0
More than 10 years	119	26.0
I do not live in the inner city	34	7.0
Total Responses	456	100.0
Missing	14	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Age

Among those who stated their age, the majority of respondents were adults between the ages of 21 and 50 years. In particular, most were between the ages of 31 and 40 (37%). Only 23 people (6%) fell between the ages of 61 and 77 years (Table 1.5).

Table 1.5 Age of Respondent

Age Range (yrs.)	Number	Percentage*
0-10	5	1.0
11-20	12	3.0
21-30	89	22.0
31-40	148	37.0
41-50	91	23.0
51-60	28	7.0
61-70	18	5.0
71-77	5	1.0
Total Responses	396	99.0
Missing	74	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

* Does not total 100% due to rounding.

Gender

Of the 452 people who recorded their gender, more than 70% (n=328) were female (Table 1.6).

Table 1.6 Gender of Respondent

Gender	Number	Percentage
Female	328	73.0
Male	124	27.0
Total Responses	452	100.0
Missing	18	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Household Size

In general, the people who participated in this survey lived in relatively large households. More than half (n=250) of the households represented were comprised of 3 or more persons. Meanwhile, 19% (n=84) lived alone while 26% (n=116) lived in 2 person households (Table 1.7).

Table 1.7 Household Size of Respondent

Size	Number	Percentage
1 person	84	19.0
2 persons	116	26.0
3 persons	110	24.0
4 persons	95	21.0
5 plus persons	45	10.0
Total Responses	450	100.0
Missing	20	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Family Structure

Of those respondents who stated their family structure, 45% (n=203) lived in two parent families with children under 18 still living at home. Conversely, just 15% (n=68) were lone parent families with underage children. Couples comprised 16% (n=73) of the responses while another 16% (n=71) stated that they lived alone (Table 1.8).

Table 1.8 Family Structure of Respondent

Family Structure	Number	Percentage
Families with children under 18 at home	203	45.0
Couples (married, common-law)	73	16.0
Living Alone	71	16.0
Lone parents with children under 18 at home	68	15.0
Other	34	8.0
Total Responses	449	100.0
Missing	21	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Annual Household Income

Annual household income was relatively low for those who responded to this question (n=420). Twenty-five percent of respondents (n=104) earned less than $15,999 annually. Only 12% (n=52) reported incomes in the $36,000 to 49,999 range (Table 1.9).

Table 1.9 Annual Household Income of Respondent

Income	Number	Percentage
Less than $15,999	104	25.0
$16,000 - 25,999	69	16.0
26,000 - 35,999	35	8.0
$36,000 - 49,999	52	12.0
Do not wish to respond	83	20.0
Total Responses	420	100.0
Missing	50	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Birthplace

Of the 430 respondents who reported their place of birth, 65% (n=277) were Canadian born. Six percent (n=26) stated China or Hong Kong as their place of birth and another 6% (n=24) stated the former Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Albania, or Slovenia (Table 1.10).

Table 1.10 Birthplace of Respondent

Birthplace	Number	Percentage
Canada	277	65.0
China/Hong Kong	26	6.0
Former Yugoslavia/Bosnia/Albania/Slovenia	24	6.0
Philippines	15	4.0
United Kingdom	14	3.0
Western Europe	13	3.0
Eastern Europe/Russia	13	3.0
Other	12	3.0
South East Asia	11	2.0
Central America	11	2.0
South America	7	2.0
Middle East	6	1.0
Total Responses	**429**	**100.0**
Missing	41	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

Length of Residency in Canada

Of the 124 respondents born in a country other than Canada, 27% (n=33) have lived in Canada for less than five years. Conversely, 27% (n=34) of the non-Canadian born respondents have lived in this country for more than twenty years (Table 1.11).

Table 1.11 Length of Residency in Canada (If born in a different country)

Length of Residency	Number	Percentage
Less than 5 years	33	27.0
5 to 10 years	30	24.0
11 to 20 years	27	22.0
Over 20 years	34	27.0
Total Responses	124	100.0
Missing	113	
Total Surveys (not born in Canada)	237	

(Non-probability sample)

2. Issues and Challenges

This section presents issues and challenges noted in the questionnaire as something that respondents were "very concerned about" (Appendex B: question 4). Crime and safety issues, access to health care, and cost of housing emerged as key areas of concern.

Table 2.1, on the next page, presents the top thirteen issues and challenges (i.e. 200 or more responses given). Also shown, is the breakdown of responses according to each community.

Table 2.1 Community by Key Issues and Challenges (Question 4: "I am very concerned about it")

Issue/ Challenge	Community														
	ING	RAM	VIC	DTN	EAU	DNN	ERL	CLI	MIS	LMR	CON	BNK	SNA	OTH	TNT
1. Safety in the neighbourhood	15	64	16	43	3	8	11	14	15	4	17	3	3	95	311
2. Burglary	13	64	12	32	2	8	13	11	12	6	13	4	2	74	266
3. Access to healthcare serv's	15	49	16	35	2	7	7	10	9	6	20	1	3	82	262
4. Vandalism	13	61	14	36	2	7	12	11	10	4	13	4	1	73	261
5. Cost of housing	8	45	14	50	1	5	7	8	13	5	17	2	4	79	258
6. Safety of children at school	12	55	8	34	3	6	5	5	9	2	15	3	1	88	246
7. Teen violence	9	49	10	35	2	7	10	9	9	5	14	1	2	80	242
8. Having enough money	7	41	12	43	2	4	3	9	10	4	16	-	3	75	229
9. Cost of education prog.	8	40	9	36	2	8	4	8	3	5	14	2	4	71	214
10. Homelessness	14	45	13	39	2	4	8	6	7	5	9	1	1	56	210
11. Domestic violence	12	43	9	30	3	8	8	6	9	3	8	2	3	67	211
12. Prostitution	11	60	13	27	3	6	11	5	6	3	10	1	2	48	206
13. Reading and writing skills	7	40	6	33	3	7	8	10	4	4	11	1	2	64	200
Total Responses	144	656	152	473	30	85	112	112	116	56	177	25	31	952	3116

*Table lists issues and challenges where >200 responses were recorded.

Total Surveys Returned by Community	24	91	25	67	3	13	20	20	18	9	30	4	5	135	**464**

Table 2.2 categorizes the issues and challenges noted above according to general themes (as noted in question 4 of the questionnaire).

Table 2.2 Top Ranked Issues and Challenges According to Themes

Theme	Responses	Rank
1. Crime / Safety		
Safety in the neighbourhood	314	1
Burglary	268	2
Vandalism	262	5
Safety of my children at school	248	6
Prostitution	207	12
Violence		
Teen violence	245	7
Domestic violence	212	11
2. Access to Health Care Services	265	3
3. Housing		
Cost of housing	262	4
Homelessness	212	10
4. Having Enough Money	231	8
5. Literacy / Education		
Cost of educational programs	218	9
Reading and writing skills	204	13

(Non-probability sample)

Crime, Safety and Violence (Open-ended responses)

It is interesting to note that when respondents were asked about other important issues in the community, many of them took this as an opportunity to expand upon the themes highlighted above. In addition to mentioning crime, vandalism and safety, respondents also pointed to a lack of security, house break-ins, and increased bicycle theft.

Of particular note were the many comments that pertained to drugs, prostitution and policing in the area. In the words of these respondents:

> *There are certain areas within each neighbourhood where drug users, prostitutes and "shady characters" frequent. I wonder why they are not patrolled regularly. If it is so obvious to the residents, why not to the police?*
>
> *Needles and condoms. More and better policing in the inner city area.*

> *Drugs – The number of residents who don't consider "pot" a drug and either sell it from their homes or buy it. Lack of residential concern!*

One person argued that these issues are of concern to all Calgarians, not just those living in the inner city:

> *Prostitution issues affect each citizen of Calgary. No customers, no business. Sex trade offenders don't all live downtown.*

For some respondents, the issue of domestic violence was closely related to matters of crime and safety. As one person put it:

> *My neighbours upstairs verbal and mental abuse of met [sic] my children. The lack of police intervention. Lack of help to move family to safer place to live.*

> *Amount of domestic violence seen/heard by my children via outside and next door.*

Access to Health Care Services

In this survey, access to health care services ranked 3rd overall. Respondents voiced concerns about finding doctors in the community, access to "emergency" medical services, and access to the closest hospital.

Housing

Respondents noted the lack of low rent housing and the need for transitional housing for families in the inner city. One person expressed the need for:

> *Places for the homeless men and women. More for women than for men, or for couples together.*

Also mentioned were concerns about "slum lords," communication with landlord/caretakers, and "homeless staying in the park."

Financial

For those inner city residents who participated in this survey, "having enough money" (ranked 8) was more of a concern than debt (ranked 25). Indeed, several respondents spoke specifically to this problem:

> *Child welfare to be more understanding about you as a parent and how hard it can be when you don't get enough income.*
>
> *Not enough resources to help low income families with a damage deposit or emergency. That may come.*
>
> *Many in the city do not have resources on hand.*

Literacy/Education

In addition to concern expressed over the "cost of educational programs" and "reading and writing skills," respondents focused on the "quality of education" offered in the area. Similarly, many of the respondents were troubled by "Ramsay school closing" and expressed concern over the potential for

> *inner city deterioration and resulting lack of community/neighbourhood feeling.*

It was also noted that

> *... underfunding of schools yields young offenders who grow into adult offenders.*

This person's written comments brought the importance of these concerns into focus:

> *I am very concern that if there is a good scull in the community.*

Meanwhile, access to libraries was also highlighted as an important issue. In particular, respondents expressed concern over the closure of Memorial Park Library. As these people noted:

> *It would be a mistake to close it.*
>
> *Keep Memorial Park Library open – please.*

Other Important Issues

In addition to those highlighted above, several other key areas of concern emerged. These are as follows:

1. Traffic

Over and over respondents commented on the volume of traffic "speeding through residential areas." Of particular concern were:

- 14th Street and 20th Avenue to 28th Avenue SW (heavy volume of traffic)
- 24th Avenue SW (speed bumps needed)
- Elbow Drive and 4th Street SW (speeding and failing to stop at cross walks)
- 10th Street SE (speeding through playground zone)

One person pointed out

> *that Businesses and the City [need to] remember people live downtown – not just pass through from work to home.*

2. Environment

This theme points to "environmental quality and maintenance of existing vegetation, parks, green space, and playground facilities." In addition to noting the problem of "trees dying and not being replaced," respondents requested

> *more green space, less development. Less condos, less high rises.*

There was also a concern over the "cleanliness" of the community. For example:

> *Dogs and cats off-leash ... [are] being allowed to foul neighbour's property, scatter garbage, and kill birds.*

Other concerns included: road maintenance, sidewalk paving, alley paving, street cleaning, snow shoveling, and recycling.

3. Planning and Development

Respondents want to be better informed of City planning issues – "more info is better." In terms of "development imposition," there were concerns over Stampede expansion "and how that will impact renters." One person noted, "enough already!" Requests were also made for "more heritage protection of historic resources."

4. Recreation

Cost of recreation programs (ranked 14) was more of a concern than access to programs (ranked 23) and variety/availability of programs (ranked 24). However, when asked about other areas of concern, several respondents made specific requests for various recreation programs and activities. These included:

- Youth/young adult activities (i.e. sports or socials)
- Low cost recreation activities for children such as gymnastics, craft classes, swimming, piano
- Arts and literature training for all ages. "Not enough places to study art e.g. painting, dance, theatre for low income."
- More programs aimed at before school, lunch, after school, holidays, etc.
- Activities encouraging interaction with various demographic groups (i.e. seniors and youth)
- Indoor water pool leisure centre right in Chinatown or downtown

5. Transportation

Difficulties getting around the city (ranked 16) and cost of transportation (ranked 17) were also important. Respondents noted that public transportation was "poor" and that there was a problem with "getting around the city on transit – easily."

6. Creating Community

Some respondents noted that that there was the potential for apathy among inner city residents. These people wanted "someone to call on, support" from those in the area. As one person said,

> *We need to know more about people in our community and help them be more neighbourly.*

The desire to work toward "generating a real sense of 'community'" was echoed in the following suggestion to

> *develop a sense of community through community involvement and relevant activities, i.e., barter system/helping neighbours, etc.*

Those who noted that they were "fortunate in that we do not need access to services, or when we do, we are able to obtain the assistance required" argued that, "some of these issues are important to me because they affect those living around me."

3. Services

Services Used

Respondents were reminded of a range of services offered in the inner city and were then asked to check off every service they used (Appendix B: question 5). The top four services used were the library (n=296 responses), doctor/medical services (n=258), recreation/leisure programs (n=200), and school/education services (n=196).

Table 3.1, on the next two pages, shows all of the services ranked according to the total number of responses given for each service on the list. A breakdown of the responses according to each community is also noted.

Table 3.1 Community by Services Used in the Inner City (Question 5: "What kinds of services do you use in the inner city?")

Services	Community														
	Inglewood	Ramsay	Victoria Park	Downtown	Eau Claire	Chinatown	Erlton	Cliff Bungalow	Mission	Lower Mount Royal	Crescent Heights	Beltline	Rosscarrock	Other	Total Responses
1. Library	11	43	17	42	3	7	13	17	16	6	23	3	3	92	296
2. Doctor/Medical	17	42	12	44	2	1	9	10	11	6	21	2	4	77	258
3. Rec/Leisure Programs	11	34	11	18	2	2	14	6	13	3	15	4	2	65	200
4. School/ Education	10	45	7	22	1	4	5	2	8	3	13	2	3	71	196
5. Social Events/Activities	6	38	8	15	1	-	6	9	8	2	7	-	1	46	147
6. Place of Worship	6	16	8	18	3	2	3	4	8	3	8	1	1	34	112
7. Before/After School Programs	4	14	1	13	1	4	2	1	5	-	7	3	1	32	89
8. Job Search/ Training	3	7	6	19	1	-	-	1	2	1	6	1	-	32	79
9. Info/Referral/ Advocacy	1	14	5	13	1	2	-	2	3	-	3	1	-	28	73
10. Counselling	7	11	4	17	-	1	-	-	5	-	1	1	1	24	72
11. Food Bank	-	8	6	12	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	1	35	67
12. Clothing Exchange	3	5	7	6	-	1	1	-	2	-	3	1	-	35	64
13. Parent Support Groups	3	8	2	5	-	1	-	-	2	-	1	1	-	24	47
14. Housing Agencies	1	8	3	10	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	20	46
15. Immigrant Agencies	-	1	3	14	-	2	-	1	3	-	3	-	-	16	43
16. Language Training	-	1	1	11	-	1	-	-	1	-	4	1	-	13	33
17. Child Welfare	-	2	1	4	-	1	-	-	2	-	5	1	1	16	33
18. Special Needs Program	-	6	1	5	-	1	1	-	2	-	3	1	-	9	29
19. Community Kitchen	-	2	4	3	-	-		1	1	-	-	1	-	16	29

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Table 3.1 Community by Services Used in the Inner City (Question 5: "What kinds of services do you use in the inner city?")

Services	Community														
	Inglewood	Ramsay	Victoria Park	Downtown	Elbow	Chinatown	Erlton	Cliff Bungalow	Mission	Lower Mount Royal	Connaught	Bankview	Beltline	Other	Total Responses
20. Emergency Shelters	-	2	4	8	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	12	28
21. Aboriginal Services	-	1	3	5	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	14	26
22. Seniors Club	3	2	1	3	-	-	-	2	3	-	3	-	-	3	24
23. Youth Leadership	2	2	1	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	10	20
24. Teen Drop In Centre	3	3	2	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	8	21
25. Anger Management	-	3	1	1	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	6	17
Total Responses	91	318	119	311	15	35	55	58	105	25	128	28	20	738	2049

Total Surveys Returned by Community	24	91	25	67	3	13	20	20	18	9	30	4	5	135	**484**

When asked to list specific inner city agencies where services are currently, or have been, received, the majority of responses focused on health/medical/family resource centres (n=160)[4]. This was followed by mention of particular schools in the area (n=138), immigrant serving agencies (n=89), libraries (n=55), shelters (n=26), recreation/leisure programs (n=21), counselling agencies (n=14), daycares (n=12), job search/training (n=8), Aboriginal serving agencies (n=6), food banks (n=5), child welfare and social services (n=5), mental health services (n=4), places of worship (n=4), Exit (street youth) (n=3), Kerby Centre (seniors) (n=3), social housing (n=3), special needs (n=3), and others (n-20). Table 3.2 enumerates the particular agencies specified by respondents for the top six services listed above.

Table 3.2 Respondent Specified Services/Agencies Used (Total responses>20)

Services	Responses
Health/Medical/Family Resource Centres:	
Alexandra	56
Calgary Urban Project Society (CUPS)	47
8th and 8th	25
Churchill Park	8
Holy Cross Campus	3
Bow Valley College	2
General/other mention	19
Total	160
Schools:	
St. Monica	42
Ramsay	26
Rideau Park	20
Connaught	14
Sunalta	13
W.R. Cushing	12
Earl Grey	6
Western Canada	2
General mention	3
Total	138
Immigrant Serving Agencies:	
Calgary Catholic Immigration Society (CCIS)	54
Chinese Community Services	28
Calgary Immigrant Aid Society	4
General mention	3
Total	89

(Continued)

[4] This does not include family resource centres housed by immigrant serving agencies. These are included in the total for immigrant serving agencies.

(Continued from previous page)

Table 3.2 Respondent Specified Services/Agencies Used (Total responses>20)

Services	Responses
Libraries:	
Memorial Park	40
Calhoun	1
Downtown	1
General mention	13
Total	55
Shelters:	
Mustard Seed	8
Drop-In Centre	6
Inn From the Cold	4
Salvation Army	4
Women's Shelters	4
Total	26
Recreation/Leisure Programs (Fitness Centres):	
Lindsay Park	10
YMCA (Eau Claire, Old Y)	4
YWCA	3
Other	4
Total	21

(Non-probability sample)

Most Wanted Services

Respondents were then asked to review the list of services (Appendix B: question 6), and indicate the top five services they would most like to see in the inner city. Once again, schools (n=74 responses), libraries (n=45), doctor/medical services (n=45), and recreation/leisure programs (n=28) were in the top four.

Table 3.3, on the next two pages, shows a ranked listing of the services along with the breakdown of responses for each community. Since everyone did not answer question 6, response totals for each service listed are lower than those noted in Table 3.1.

Table 3.3 Community by Services Most Wanted in the Inner City (Question 6: "...five services you would most like to see.")

Services	Community														
	Inglewood	Ramsay	Victoria Park	Downtown	Eau Claire	Chinatown	Erlton	Cliff Bungalow	Mission	Lower Mount Royal	Connaught	Bankview	Sunalta	Other	Total Responses*
1. School/ Education	-	27	1	14	1	2	-	1	2	1	5	1	1	18	74
2. Library	3	3	3	6	1	-	2	3	4	1	9	-	1	9	45
3. Doctor/Medical	8	11	4	3	-	1	3	2	2	1	-	1	1	8	45
4. Rec/Leisure Programs	1	4	1	4	-	1	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	12	28
5. Before/After School Programs	2	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	17
6. Housing Agencies	-	2	3	3	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	4	14
7. Job Search/ Training	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	5	12
8. Emergency Shelters	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	10	13
9. Youth Leadership	1	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8
10. Place of Worship	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	7
11. Parent Support Groups	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	3	6
12. Community Kitchen	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6
13. Special Needs Program	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	5
14. Counselling	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5
15. Info/Referral/ Advocacy	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	5
16. Immigrant Agencies	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	4
17. Food Bank	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	4
18. Language Training	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Table 3.3 Community by Services Most Wanted in the Inner City (Question 6: "...five services you would most like to see.")

Services	Community														
	Inglewood	Ramsay	Victoria Park	Downtown	East Claire	Chinatown	Erlton	Cliff Bungalow	Mission	Lower Mount Royal	Connaught	Bankview	Sunalta	Other	Total Responses
19. Child Welfare	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	3
20. Aboriginal Services	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
21. Anger Management	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
22. Social Events/Activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
23. Teen Drop In Centre	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
24. Seniors Club	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total Responses	16	65	19	42	2	8	8	10	15	4	21	4	4	95	313

Total Surveys Returned by Community	24	91	25	67	3	13	20	20	18	9	30	4	5	135	**464**

Accessing Community Programs

Respondents were also asked to select from a list, reasons that prevented them from using community programs. The main reasons included not knowing about what programs exist (37%), inconvenient times (25%), and high costs (25%) (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Reasons Given For Not Using Community Programs

Reasons	Number	Percentage*
I don't know what programs exist	176	37.0
It is not at a convenient time	119	25.0
It is too expensive	115	24.0
Nobody to look after my children	82	17.0
I don't have any way to get there	79	17.0
It is too far from home	78	17.0
Do not offer the programs I want	64	14.0
I don't' know how to apply for the programs	57	12.0
Other	36	8.0
I have difficulties understanding English	25	5.0
Access issues for special needs	23	5.0
The programs offered conflict with my cultural values	12	3.0

(Non-probability sample)
* Percentages do not total 100 because respondents were allowed more than one answer.

Some respondents (n=18) noted that they "have a full and happy life" and "have no need for programs." Others (n=11) were "too busy."

Location of Services

The questionnaire stated that new locations were being considered for services in the inner city. When asked to rank these locations in order of preference, respondents favoured schools (46%) followed by community associations (43%), community health centres (42%), and recreation centres (38%). (Table 3.5)

Table 3.5 Preferred Location for Services (sum of top three choices)

Locations	Number	Percentage*
Schools	216	46.0
Community Association	202	43.0
Community Health Centre	196	42.0
Recreation Centre	180	38.0
Shopping Mall	90	19.0
Place of Worship	64	14.0
Other	17	4.0

(Non-probability sample)
*Percentages do not total 100 because respondents were allowed more than one answer.

It was noted that a "central location", "close to C-train" was preferred. Some respondents objected to shopping malls noting that "shopping malls destroy community. We have all these!"

4. Experiencing a Sense of Community

The questionnaire informs respondents that "a community is where you receive support and a sense of belonging." In an effort to know more about where those in the inner city experienced a sense of community, respondents were asked where they received support and a sense of belonging. Friends (78%), family (70%), and neighbours (43%) emerged as the main sources of community for these inner city folks (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Sources of Support and Sense of Belonging

Support	Number	Percentage*
Friends	368	78.0
Family	327	70.0
Neighbours	203	43.0
Place of Worship	172	37.0
Social Agencies	88	19.0
Those of the Same Religious Background	77	16.0
Those of the Same Cultural Background	65	14.0
Family Resource Centre	64	14.0
Other	25	5.0

(Non-probability sample)

* Percentages do not total 100 because respondents were allowed more than one answer.

Several people noted that schools, clubs, community associations, and places such as a community garden or coffee house created opportunities for belonging and support.

IV. Volunteers

1. Sharing Strengths and Talents

A volunteer opportunity form was included in the questionnaire in an effort to give interested respondents the opportunity to let the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network know about some of their strengths and talents (see Appendix C). Sixty-seven people expressed an interest in volunteering their time. As a result, the ICFRCN decided to host a day long Inner City Resource and Volunteer Fair (scheduled for September 30, 2000) in an attempt to match volunteers to local organizations and grass roots groups.

The main purpose of the Fair was to invite inner city residents who were interested in volunteering to participate in a free, one day Fair that profiled inner city service organizations, non-profit groups, and community groups that required volunteers. Additionally, the Fair was intended to be an opportunity for raising awareness about the large number of resources existing in the inner city.

Many of the sixty-seven volunteers interested in organizing events were contacted and three of them expressed an interest in assisting with the planning of the Fair. Staff from The City of Calgary's Community and Neighbourhood Services, along with inner city service providers, also participated in planning, designing, and implementing the project. Local service organizations, community groups, churches, etc. were asked to provide descriptions of volunteer opportunities as well as staffed display booths and interactive games for attendees. The Victoria Park Community Association agreed to provide their facility free-of-charge to help raise the profile of the community while the Calgary Catholic Immigration Society, a member of the INCFRCN, agreed to act as the fiscal agent for the Fair. Event planners expect approximately 300 people to attend the fair, including agency, volunteer, and general public participation.

IV. Recommendations

It is recommended:

- That the results of the Inner City Survey be used as one part of the planning process for the formation of an inner city **Community Coordinating Council**;

- That the results of the Inner City Survey be used as one part of the planning process for the formation of an inner city **Community Resource Centre**;

- That the findings of this report are disseminated as follows:

  1. Full report to Inner City Family Resource Centre Network members;
  2. Summary of Findings to all organizations noted in Appendix A: Origin of Survey;
  3. Summary of Findings made available to exhibitors and attendees at the September 30, 2000 Inner City Resource and Volunteer Fair;
  4. Summary of Findings to all inner city Community Associations.

- That further studies are conducted in the inner city to augment the findings of this report.

Appendix A: Origin of Survey

Origin	Number	Percentage
CUPS	47	10.0
Calgary Catholic Immigration Society (CCIS)	43	9.0
St. Monica's School	41	9.0
Ramsay Community Brunch	40	9.0
Memorial Park Library	37	8.0
Chinese Community Association	28	6.0
Ramsay School	25	5.0
Rideau Park School	21	5.0
Alexandra Centre	20	4.0
8th and 8th Health Centre	18	4.0
Erlton Community Association	16	3.0
Tri-Area Christmas Party	15	3.0
Cliff Bungalow AGM	14	3.0
Connaught School	13	3.0
Sunalta School	13	3.0
WR Cushing School	13	3.0
Mount Royal House Apartments	11	2.0
Victoria Park Garden Party	11	2.0
Inner City CCC* Information Forum	9	2.0
Catholic Family Services (CFS)	8	2.0
Churchill Park	7	2.0
Listening Conference**	7	2.0
Earl Grey School	5	1.0
Tri Area Women's Group	5	1.0
Ramsay Craft Sale	3	1.0
Total Responses	470	100.0
Missing	0	
Total Surveys	470	

(Non-probability sample)

*Community Coordinating Council

** Aboriginal conference

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Page 1:

Inner City Survey

Do you live in the following inner city communities?

Or, do you use services in the inner city?

- Bankview
- Chinatown
- Cliff Bungalow- Mission
- Connaught
- Downtown
- Eau Claire
- Erlton
- Inglewood
- Lower Mount Royal
- Ramsay
- Sunalta
- Victoria Park

If you do, we want to know what issues in the inner city are important to YOU and what YOU would like to see in these communities!

The following is a brief survey where you can tell us what types of services you want to see in the inner city. Your opinion is valuable! Please take **5 minutes** to let us know what kind of community you want to live in.

This survey is also available in the following languages:

- ***Chinese***
- ***Polish***
- ***Serbo-Croatian***
- ***Vietnamese***

If you require further assistance filling out the survey, or you would like to get a copy of the survey in the above languages, please call _____.

Page 2:

Introduction

The Survey is in two parts:

Part I - questions about the community you live in and/or the services you use in the inner city.
Part II - questions about you and your family.

- Do not answer any questions you do not want to answer.
- All information we collect is private and confidential. Information will not be used for any other purpose.
- Your participation is invaluable! To volunteer, please remove the Volunteer Opportunity Form and hand in separately.

Part I - Questions about the Community

1. Which community do you currently live in?

⬭ Bankview
⬭ Chinatown
⬭ Cliff Bungalow-Mission
⬭ Connaught
⬭ Downtown
⬭ Eau Claire
⬭ Victoria Park
⬭ Erlton
⬭ Inglewood
⬭ Lower Mount Royal
⬭ Ramsay
⬭ Sunalta
⬭ Other, please specify _____

2. If you are unsure of which community you live in, please indicate your **postal code** or **street name** to help us determine your community:

_____

3. How long have you lived in the inner city?

⬭ Less than 1 year
⬭ 1 to 5 years
⬭ 5 to 10 years
⬭ more than 10 years
⬭ I do not live in the inner city

Page 3:

4. We would like to know about the challenges you face and the issues that are important to you. Please indicate how you feel by circling the answer that best describes you.

	I am not concerned about it	I am somewhat concerned about it	I am very concerned about it
Childcare			
Cost of childcare	1	2	3
Quality of childcare	1	2	3
Access to childcare	1	2	3
Youth Issues			
Teen pregnancy	1	2	3
Teen violence	1	2	3
Employment			
Job training/skills	1	2	3
Finding a job	1	2	3
Unemployment	1	2	3
Financial			
Debt	1	2	3
Having enough money	1	2	3
Disabled/Special Needs			
Accessing services for disabled	1	2	3
Cost of services for disabled	1	2	3
Recreation			
Variety/availability of recreational activities	1	2	3
Cost of recreational programs	1	2	3
Accessing recreational programs	1	2	3
Health			
Access to healthcare services	1	2	3
Alcohol and/or substance use	1	2	3
Mental health issues/counselling	1	2	3

Page 4:

[redacted]

4. *(continued)*	I am not concerned about it	I am somewhat concerned about it	I am very concerned about it
Seniors (age 65 and over)			
Supports for seniors	1	2	3
Accessing senior programs	1	2	3
Cost of senior programs	1	2	3
Transportation			
Difficulties getting around the city	1	2	3
Cost of transportation	1	2	3
Literacy/Education			
Cost of educational programs	1	2	3
Reading and writing skills	1	2	3
Visible Minorities/Immigrants			
Language skills	1	2	3
Cultural barriers	1	2	3
Discrimination	1	2	3
Aboriginal			
Aboriginal Issues	1	2	3
Housing			
Finding a place to live	1	2	3
Cost of housing (rent/mortgage)	1	2	3
Homelessness	1	2	3
Violence			
Domestic violence	1	2	3
Crime/Safety			
Safety in the neighbourhood	1	2	3
Safety of my children at school	1	2	3
Prostitution	1	2	3
Vandalism	1	2	3
Burglary	1	2	3

Page 5:

Are there other issues in the community that are important to you?_____

_____

_____

5. What kinds of services do you use in the inner city? *Check all that apply.* **(If 'NONE,' please go to question 6)**

- ○ Before/after school programs
- ○ Parent support groups
- ○ Youth leadership
- ○ Recreation/leisure programs
- ○ Library
- ○ Place of worship
- ○ Special needs programs
- ○ Aboriginal services
- ○ Immigrant agencies
- ○ Community kitchen
- ○ Anger management
- ○ Housing agencies (Calhome, Calgary Housing Authority, Kerby Centre)
- ○ Child Welfare (Calgary Rocky View Child and Family Services)
- ○ School/Education
- ○ Teen drop in centre
- ○ Doctor/medical
- ○ Food bank
- ○ Counselling
- ○ Seniors clubs
- ○ Clothing exchange
- ○ Language training
- ○ Job search/training
- ○ Social events/activities
- ○ Emergency shelters
- ○ Information/referral/ advocacy agencies

Please list the inner city agencies where you have received services, or are currently receiving services.

_____

_____

6. From the list of services above, please indicate the **five** services you would **most** like to see in the inner city *(1 is the most important.)*

1._____ 4_____
2._____ 5_____
3._____

Page 6:

7. What are some reasons that prevent you from using community programs? *Please check all that apply.*

- ⬭ I don't have any way to get there
- ⬭ It is too far from home
- ⬭ It is not at a convenient time
- ⬭ It is too expensive
- ⬭ I don't know what programs exist
- ⬭ Do not offer the programs I want
- ⬭ I don't know how to apply for the programs
- ⬭ Nobody to look after my children
- ⬭ Access issues for special needs
- ⬭ I have difficulties speaking/understanding English
- ⬭ The programs offered conflict with my cultural values
- ⬭ Other, please specify_____

8. We are considering new locations for services in the inner city. What would work best for you? Please rank these locations in order of preference *(1 is the best choice.)*

- ___ Community associations/centre
- ___ Place of worship
- ___ Shopping mall
- ___ Schools
- ___ Recreation centre
- ___ Community health centre
- ___ Other, please specify _____

9. A community is where you receive support and a sense of belonging. Where do **you** receive support and a sense of belonging? *Check all that apply.*

- __ Family
- __ Place of work
- __ Those of the same cultural background
- __ Social agencies
- __ Other, please specify_____
- __ Friends
- __ Neighbours
- __ Those of the same religious background
- __ Family resource centre

Page 7:

Part II – Questions about you and your family

10. Please indicate if you are:

⬭ Male ⬭ Female Age:_____

11. Who lives with you?

Males: Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____

Females: Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____
Age ___ Relationship to you? _____

12. Do you have children living outside the home? *Please circle.*

Yes No

If 'Yes', how many children? *Please circle.*

1 2 3 4

What are their ages? _____ _____ _____ _____

13. What is your ethnic/cultural background? (i.e. Chinese, Polish, Aboriginal, etc..)

_____

14. Where were you born? _____

If you were born outside Canada, how long have you been in Canada? _____ years

15. What is your annual household income?

⬭ Less than $15,999
⬭ $16,000 – 25,999
⬭ $26,000 – 35,999
⬭ $36,000 – 49,999
⬭ Over $50,000
⬭ Do not want to respond

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey!

Page 8:

Who are we?

We are the ***Inner City Family Resource Centre Network*** and our members are made up of residents and social service agencies located in Calgary's Inner City communities.

Our Purpose is to:
Coordinate the resources and services in meeting the needs of the inner city communities and those communities that use these services.

Our Goal is:
To facilitate the formation of one or more Community Coordinating Councils in the Inner city to provide community and service agency input into the planning and delivery of services for families and individuals.

Why are we doing this survey?

Your responses will help us work towards better inner city communities!
Your feedback will provide a community voice into what services may be needed in the inner city.

Based on your input, we will investigate the possibility of developing a ***Community Resource Centre*** in the inner city. The ***Centre*** would be an easy access 'one-stop-shopping' for a full range of services and programs. It will be a place where you can meet your peers or neighbours for coffee, share your talents, utilize services, and receive the supports you need.

Partners of the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network:

Community Residents
The City of Calgary
  Community & Social Development
  Parks & Recreation
Calgary Rocky View Child and Family Services
Alexandra Community Health Centre
Calgary Public Library – Memorial Park Branch
Calgary Catholic Immigration Society/The Family Place
Calgary Chinese Community Services Association
Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Council
Churchill Park Family Care Society
Catholic Family Service
Mosaic Centre (CIAS)
CUPS Community Health Centre
8th and 8th Health Centre

Appendix C: Volunteer Opportunity Form

Please remove from Survey and hand in separately.

Volunteer Opportunity

We need interested volunteers! Your participation and input is invaluable to the community.

1. There are many ways to volunteer in the community! Are you interested in becoming involved in the following areas? *Check all that apply.*

○ **Developing an Inner City Coordinating Council**
(may involve establishing an inner city community resource centre, participating in community discussions, compiling data, sitting on a committee, organizing events, and other tasks)

○ **Volunteering for the Inner City Communities**
(i.e. being involved with a community association, organizing community events, being a volunteer for community programs)

2. The following are some examples of **skills** or **talents *you*** might want to share. *Check all that interests you.*

○ Organizing events
○ Cooking/baking
○ Being involved with youth
○ Being involved with children
○ Being involved with seniors
○ Working with new-Canadians
○ Helping the mentally ill
○ Being involved in in recreational programs
○ Driving (providing transportation)
○ Office administration
○ Desktop publishing
○ Data collection/analysis
○ Being on a committee
○ Chairing/leading discussions
○ Fundraising
○ Music (sing, play an instrument)
○ Arts/crafts/hobbies
○ Decorating (for events)
○ Construction
○ First aid training
○ Stress management

○ Other, please specify:_____

_____

Volunteer Opportunity

If you are interested in volunteering in the **Inner City**, please call:

***OR* - leave us your name and phone number and we will contact you.**

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

What is the best time for you to volunteer? Check all that apply

○ Mornings ○ Afternoons ○ Evenings

○ Weekdays ○ Week-ends

I have time to volunteer:

○ Weekly ○ Monthly

The information collected will be used to build a volunteer database for the Inner City Family Resource Centre Network, Inner City Community Associations and Agencies. Information collected will not be used for any other purpose and is subject to section 32.C under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. For more information, please contact:

Thank you very much for your participation!
We appreciate you taking the time to become involved!